Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

FEB 13 2005
WENDERUTH, LIND & PONACK

Best Available Copy

OIPE		
[F0]	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Sumary	09/422,804 Examiner	SOUTHERN, EDWIN
		Art Unit
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	John S. Brusca	1631
Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet will	n the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNIC, 136(a). In no event, however, may a repwill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTILE. cause the application to become ABA	ATION. bly be timely filed HS from the mailing date of this communication. NDONED (35.U.S.C. & 133)
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 N	lovombor 2005	
. (7	action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar		or procedution on to the
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Tx narte Onavle 1035 C.D.	a, prosecution as to the ments is
	ix parte quayre, 1909 C.D.	11, 400 O.G. 210.
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) <u>17-99</u> is/are pending in the application		
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>40-95</u> is/are withdraw	n from consideration.	
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>17-26,38,39 and 96-99</u> is/are rejected		
7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>27-37</u> is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce	. Inted or hill abjected to bu	the Everiees
Applicant may not request that any objection to the d		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction. 11) The path or declaration is objected to by the Event	on is required if the drawing(s) i	is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	иниет. Note the attached O	ince Action or form PTO-152.
riority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign p a) All b) Some * c) None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 11	9(a)-(d) or (f).
1. Certified copies of the priority documents	have been received	
2. Certified copies of the priority documents		cation No. PCT/CP90/004en
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority	nave been received in Appil	caudi No. <u>PCT/GB89/UU46U</u> .
application from the International Bureau (y documents have been fec (DCT pula 47 2/a))	eiveu iii triis National Stage
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	the cortified social and	Divod
a list of	the certified copies not rece	aved.
achment(s)		
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summ	ary (PTO-413)
Notice of Draftenessen 1 2 :		I D - 4 .
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Mai	al Patent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 09/422,804 Page 2

Art Unit: 1631

DETAILED ACTION

1. This application has been reassigned to a new examiner.

2. Due to new grounds of rejection not necessitated by the applicant's amendments this is a non-final rejection.

Election/Restrictions

- 3. Claims 40-99, filed in the amendment filed 06 December 2000 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons:
- 4. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - 1. Claims 1-39 and 96-99 drawn to oligonucleotide arrays, classified in class 536, subclass 24.3.
 - Claims 40, 42, 43, multiple dependent claims 44-56, and 57, drawn to a method of making an oligonucleotide array by attachment of presynthesized oligonucleotides, classified in class 435, subclass 6
 - 3. Claims 41, multiple dependent claims 44-56, and 58-62, drawn to a method of making an oligonucleotide array by in situ synthesis of oligonucleotides, classified in class 536, subclass 25.3
 - 4. Claims 63-67, multiple dependent claim 70-86, 89, 90, and 95, drawn to a method of using an oligonucleotide array to assay for hybridization of an applied sample, classified in class 435, subclass 6.

Art Unit: 1631

5. Claims 68, 69, multiple dependent claims 70-86, and 87, drawn to a method of using an oligonucleotide array comprising all possible sequences, classified in class 435 subclass 6.

- Claim 88, drawn to a method of using an oligonucleotide array comprising iterative hybridization with larger oligonucleotide applied samples, classified in class 435, subclass 6.
- 7. Claims 91-94, drawn to a method of using an oligonucleotide array to assay a nucleotide sequence of an applied sample, classified in class 435, subclass 6.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

- 5. Inventions 1 and Inventions 2-3 are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the array of invention 1 could be made by either the method of invention 2 or 3.
- 6. Inventions 1 and Inventions 4-7 are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the array of invention 1 can be used in any of the methods of inventions 4-7.
- 7. Inventions 2-3 and Inventions 4-7 are directed to related methods. The related inventions are distinct if the inventions as claimed do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; the

Art Unit: 1631

inventions as claimed are not obvious variants; and the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, inventions 2-3 are drawn to methods of making oligonucleotide arrays which comprise different steps, and inventions 4-7 are drawn to methods of using oligonucleotide arrays which comprise different steps and produce different results.

- 8. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 9. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Groups 1-7 are not coextensive, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 10. Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention of Invention 1, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 40-95 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Information Disclosure Statement

11. Many references in the Information Disclosure Statements filed 08 December 2005 and 20 December 2005 have not been considered because the references are not publications.

Double Patenting

12. The rejection for obviousness-type double patenting over U.S. Patent No. 6,054,270 in the Office action mailed 13 July 2005 has been withdrawn in view of the terminal disclaimer filed 28 August 2001.

Art Unit: 1631

13. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

14. An obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but an examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined claim is either anticipated by, or would be obvious

Art Unit: 1631

over, the reference claim(s). see, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

15. Claims 17, 20, 25, 26, and 39 provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 17-42 of copending Application No. 10/115077. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the copending claims are either species of the instant claims or have only minor differences.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

16. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 17. Claims 17, 19, 21-24, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Stavrianopoulos et al. (reference KB in the Information Disclosure Statement filed 08 December 2005)

The claims are drawn to arrays of oligonucleotides comprising different known oligonucleotides at different positions. In some embodiments the array has a glass substrate. In some embodiments the oligonucleotides are attached to the support by a covalent linkage.

Art Unit: 1631

Regarding the limitations of claims 23 and 24, it is brought to the Applicant's attention that a product by process claim is examined for novelty and obviousness of the claimed product only, and that no consideration is given to the novelty or obviousness of the method of making the claimed product. See M.P.E.P. 2113.

Stravrianopoulos et al. shows in column 1, lines 29-30, and column 5 an array of oligonucleotides, with a substrate that may be plastic or glass. Stavrianopoulos et al. shows in column 8, lines 40-45 that various (meaning different) polynucleotide samples may be present in the array.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 18. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 402 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 19. Claims 17, 18, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stavrianopoulos et al. in view of Cooke et al.

The claims are drawn to arrays of oligonucleotides comprising different known oligonucleotides at different positions. In some embodiments there are at least 72 samples in the array.

Stravrianopoulos et al. shows in column 1, lines 29-30, and column 5 an array of oligonucleotides, with a substrate that may be plastic or glass. Stavrianopoulos et al. shows in column 8, lines 40-45 that various (meaning different) polynucleotide samples may be present in the array. Stavrianopoulos et al. shows use of conventional microtiter plates to contain the

Art Unit: 1631

samples in columns 12, lines 20-24. Stavrianopoulos et al. does not show the number of wells that exist in conventional microtiter plates.

Cooke et al. shows microtiter plates that differ from the conventional plates by virtue of being made from disposable plastic. Cooke et al. shows in figure 1 a microtiter plate with an 8x12 matrix of wells for a total of 96 wells.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Stavrianopoulos et al. by use of the 96 well microtiter plate of Cooke et al. for the purpose of analyzing up to 96 samples in one array.

20. Claims 17 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stavrianopoulos et al. in view of Suggs et al.

The claims are drawn to arrays of oligonucleotides comprising different known oligonucleotides at different positions. In some embodiments the oligonucleotides in the array are between 8 and 20 nucleotides in length.

Stravrianopoulos et al. shows in column 1, lines 29-30, and column 5 an array of oligonucleotides, with a substrate that may be plastic or glass. Stavrianopoulos et al. shows in column 8, lines 40-45 that various (meaning different) polynucleotide samples may be present in the array. Stavrianopoulos et al. shows use of conventional microtiter plates to contain the samples in columns 12, lines 20-24. Stavrianopoulos et al. shows that the applied samples may be of small or high molecular weight in column 1, lines 29-30. Stavrianopoulos et al. shows in column 5, lines 63-67 that oligonucleotides used to hybridize to the samples on the array should be at least 25 nucleotides in length to allow for stable hybridization with the complementary

Art Unit: 1631

nucleotides of the sample on the array. Stavrianopoulos et al. does not show use of samples on an array of between 8 and 20 nucleotides in length.

Suggs et al. shows in the abstract, methods section on page 6613 and Table 1 the synthesis and use of oligonucleotide probes that are 15 nucleotides in length. Suggs et al. shows in figures 1 and 2 that such probes may be used to hybridize specifically to a complementary sequence.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Stavrianopoulos et al. by use of the 15mer probes of Suggs et al. because Suggs et al. shows that oligonucleotides of that length are long enough to allow for specific hybridization and a functional equivalent to longer oligonucleotides, and further obvious because shorter oligonucleotides allow for reduced labor and cost for synthesis.

21. Claims 96, 98, and 99 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stavrianopoulos et al. in view of Caulfield et al.

The claims are drawn to kits comprising arrays of oligonucleotides comprising different known oligonucleotides at different positions and scanners for detecting hybridization to the array.

Stavrianopoulos et al. shows in column 1, lines 29-30, and column 5 an array of oligonucleotides, and shows a microtiter substrate in column 12, lines 20-24. Stavrianopoulos et al. shows in column 8, lines 40-45 that various (meaning different) polynucleotide samples may be present in the array. Stavrianopoulos et al. shows colorimetric assays of hybridization in column 6-7 and table 1. Stavrianopoulos et al. does not show computer controlled scanners of colorimetric assays.

Art Unit: 1631

Caulfield et al. shows in the abstract and throughout a computer controlled analysis of a microtiter assay result. Caulfield et al. shows in the methods section on page 207 that an automatic scanner/reader was used to determine the level of colored product in each well of a microtiter assay, and further shows throughout the paper a computer mediated analysis of the results of the assay.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the assay of Stavrianopoulos et al. by use of the computer mediated automatic scanning and raw data analysis of Caulfield et al. to save manual labor of analyzing the results of a colorimetric microtiter assay.

Claim 97 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stavrianopoulos et al. in view of Cooke et al. as applied to claims 17, 18, and 38 above, and further in view of Caulfield et al.

The claims are drawn to a kit comprising arrays of oligonucleotides comprising at least 72 different known oligonucleotides at different positions and scanners for detecting hybridization to the array.

Stavrianopoulos et al. in view of Cooke et al. as applied to claims 17, 18, and 38 above does not show computer mediated automatic scanning and raw data analysis of a colorimetric microtiter assay.

Caulfield et al. shows in the abstract and throughout a computer controlled analysis of a microtiter assay result. Caulfield et al. shows in the methods section on page 207 that an automatic scanner/reader was used to determine the level of colored product in each well of a

Art Unit: 1631

microtiter assay, and further shows throughout the paper a computer mediated analysis of the results of the assay.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the assay of Stavrianopoulos et al. in view of Cooke et al. as applied to claims 17, 18, and 38 above by use of the computer mediated automatic scanning and raw data analysis of Caulfield et al. to save manual labor of analyzing the results of a colorimetric microtiter assay.

23. Claims 17 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stavrianopoulos et al. in view of Molecular Biosystems Inc. (WO 85/01050, reference AF in the Information Disclosure Statement filed 08 December 2005).

The claims are drawn to arrays of oligonucleotides comprising different known oligonucleotides at different positions. In some embodiments the oligonucleotide is covalently linked to the support.

Sravrianopoulos et al. shows in column 1, lines 29-30, and column 5 an array of oligonucleotides, with a substrate that may be plastic or glass. Stavrianopoulos et al. shows in column 8, lines 40-45 that various (meaning different) polynucleotide samples may be present in the array. Stavrianopoulos et al. does not show covalent linkage of oligonucleotides to supports.

Molecular Biosystems Inc. shows covalent linkages of oligonucleotides to a solid support and use of such linked oligonucleotides for hybridization assays in pages 8-9, and 34-37.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the hybridization assay of Stavrianopoulos et al. by use of the covalent linkage of Molecular Biosystems Inc. because Molecular Biosystems Inc. shows that

Art Unit: 1631

such covalent linkages are useful to tether hybridized polynucleotide duplexes for purification of the hybridized duplex in hybridization assays.

Response to Arguments

24. Applicant's arguments filed 14 November 2005 regarding the prior art rejections have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Those rejections of claims not reiterated in this Office action have been withdrawn. New grounds of rejection have been made over some claims. The applicants argue that Stavrianopoulos et al. uses the arrays for hybridization to probes, rather than using arrays of probes for hybridization to unknown samples. The intended use of the composition of Stavrianopoulos et al. is not relevant because Stavrianopoulos et al shows the claimed composition or makes obvious the claimed compositions in combination with other references as detailed above. Stavrianopoulos et al. shows use of known (and therefore predetermined) sequences on arrays. The applicants further argue that the samples of Stavrianopoulos et al are on different wells and are therefore on different surfaces, however a microtiter dish is a single surface comprising multiple depressions.

Allowable Subject Matter

25. Claims 27-37 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

26. Patent applicants with problems or questions regarding electronic images that can be viewed in the Patent Application Information Retrieval system (PAIR) can now contact the USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center (Patent EBC) for assistance. Representatives are

Art Unit: 1631

available to answer your questions daily from 6 am to midnight (EST). The toll free number is (866) 217-9197. When calling please have your application serial or patent number, the type of document you are having an image problem with, the number of pages and the specific nature of the problem. The Patent Electronic Business Center will notify applicants of the resolution of the problem within 5-7 business days. Applicants can also check PAIR to confirm that the problem has been corrected. The USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center is a complete service center supporting all patent business on the Internet. The USPTO's PAIR system provides Internet-based access to patent application status and history information. It also enables applicants to view the scanned images of their own application file folder(s) as well as general patent information available to the public.

For all other customer support, please call the USPTO Call Center at (800) 786-9199. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John S. Brusca whose telephone number is 571 272-0714. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ardin Marschel, PhD. can be reached on 571 272-0718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1631

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

S. Brusca
Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1631

jsb

							7817		
-'Sheet 1 of,+7			INFORMA	TION DISCLOSURE STATEMEN	NT .		OIPE		
FORM PTO 1449) RTMENT OF COMMERC	:E	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174		IAL NO. 122,804	DEC 210 MARCH		
PA	TENT A	ND TRADEMARK OFFIC ENCES CITED BY APPLICA	E	APPLICANT Edwin Southern					
Date S	·	veral sheets if necessary) d to PTO: December 20,	2005	FILING DATE October 22, 1999		GROUP 1631			
			U.	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS					
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE		
RB	62	4,689,405	8/1987	Frank et al.					
Je/5	86	5,348,855	9/1994	Dattagupta et al.					
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· · · · · ·	•	FORE	IGN PATENT DOCUMENTS		···	P		
	ļ	DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES NO		
165	61	1 526 708	9/1978	GB					
BB	98	0 119 573 A1	9/1994	EP					
J									
		OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (II	ncluding Author, Title, Date, Pertin	ent Pages, Etc.)				
	1	David Kitchin QC an between Oxford Ger March 22, 2081 Lon	e Technology	de, Affymetrix' Opening Su (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case ngdom.	ubmissions, in nos. HC 1999	the United King 02517, HC 1999	dom litigation 9 04645, pages 1-81,		
of the same of the	3			in the United Kingdom litig 5, pages 1-5, January 28,					
10 per	4	Kingdom litigation be	chard Meade, Bristows, Second Defendant's Response to the Claimant's Notice to Admit Facts, in the United and Second Defendant's Response to the Claimant's Notice to Admit Facts, in the United and Ingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case no. HC 1999 04645, pages 1-3, ne 22, 2000, London, United Kingdom.						
	5	Bristows, Particulars Technology (OGT) v.	of Independen Affymetrix, ca	tly Valid Claims, in the Uni se no. HC 1999 04645, pa	ited Kingdom ges 1-2, June	litigation betweer 22, 2000, Londo	n Oxford Gene on, United Kingdom.		
EXAMINER		& Bruses		DATE CONSIDERI	ED 5 Fol	eriano 20	0/		

• Sheet 2 of 17			INFORM	ATION DISCLOSURE STATEME	NT	A	OIPE
FORM PTO 144		d) ARTMENT OF COMMERC	E	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174	SERIAL 09/42	. NO. 2,804	PATE 100
\$	PATENT A	AND TRADEMARK OFFICE RENCES CITED BY APPLICA	E	APPLICANT Edwin Southern			A Maguart
Date		everal sheets if necessary) ed to PTO: December 20, 2	2005	FILING DATE October 22, 1999		GROUP 1631	
				J.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS			
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE
			FOR	REIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS	<u> </u>		
·		DOCUMENT	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION
		NUMBER	5,172	0000000	1	30000033	YES NO
		OTHER	DOCUMENT(S)	(Including Author, Title, Date, Perti	inent Pages, Etc.)		
	6	Richard Meade, Bris Oxford Gene Techno United Kingdom.	tows, Statem blogy (OGT) v	ent of Reasons, in the Unit . Affymetrix, case no. HC 1	ed Kingdom litig 1999 04645, pag	ation between es 1-4, June 30	, 2000, London,
	7	Bird & Bird, Stateme v. Affymetrix, case no	nt of Opposition HC 1999 04	on, in the United Kingdom 4645, pages 1-5, June 30,	litigation betwee 2000, London, U	n Oxford Gene Inited Kingdom.	Technology (OGT)
	8	Bird & Bird, Re-Re-R Oxford Gene Techno United Kingdom.	e-Amended F logy (OGT) v.	Particulars of Objections, in Affymetrix, case no. HC 1	the United King 999 04645, page	dom litigation be es 1-5, March 13	etween 3, 2001, London,
lister	9	Alastair Wilson QC, A Technology (OGT) v. Kingdom.	Amended Part Affymetrix, ca	ticulars of Claim, in the Uni ase no. HC 1999 82517, pa	ited Kingdom litiç ages 1-11, Nove	gation between omber 26, 1999,	Oxford Gene Oxford, United
Sur	10	Bird & Bird, Amended Technology (OGT) v. Kingdom.	l Particulars o Affymetrix, ca	of Infringement, in the Unite ase no. HC 1999 02517, pa	ed Kingdom litiga nges 12-14, Sept	tion between Or ember 1, 2000,	xford Gene London, United
7	11	Richard Meade, Defer between Oxford Gene London, United Kingd	: recnnology	nterclaim of the First and Si (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case r	econd Defendan no. HC 1999 025	ts, in the United	Kingdom litigation August 6, 1999,
	12	Richard Meade, Amer litigation between Oxfo 15, 2001, London, Uni	ora Gene Tec	ars of Objections of the Firs hnology (OGT) v. Affymetri	at and Second De ix, case no. HC 1	efendants, in the	e United Kingdom ges 21-37, January
AMINER	1	M. Buss		DATE CONSIDERS	0 560.	700	·

						AN A	
• Sheet 3 of 17			INFORMA	TION DISCLOSURE STATEMEN	<u> </u>	MALL	OIPE
FORM PTO 144	•) RTMENT OF COMMERC	F	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174	SERIAL 09/422	NO. / S	ATE CE
F	PATENT A	IND TRADEMARK OFFIC	E	APPLICANT Edwin Southern		PART	20 20054
	ez ezU)	veral sheets if necessary) d to PTO: December 20, 3		FILING DATE October 22, 1999		GROUP 1631	PADEMARI
			111	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS			
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		FORE	IGN PATENT DOCUMENTS			
		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES NO
	-						
 -				-			
- 	······································	OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (In	cluding Author, Title, Date, Pertin	ent Pages, Etc.)		
	13	Manches, Re-Re-Re- Oxford Gene Technol Kingdom.	-Amended Rep blogy (OGT) v.	oly and Defence of Counte Affymetrix, case no. HC 19	rclaim, in the Un 999 02517, pp. 3	iited Kingdom li 18-46, March 20	iligation between 000, Oxford, United
g	14	Dr. David R. Bentley Technology (OGT) v London, United King	. Affyinętrix, ca	Expert Report, in the United se nos. HC 1999 04645 ar	d Kingdom litigat nd HC 1999 025	tion between O 17, pages 1-38	xford Gene , January 30, 2001
mole	15	Oxford Gene Techno	logy (OGT) v. /	of Dr. David Bentley, in the Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1 andon, United Kingdom.	e United Kingdo 999 04645 and l	m litigation beh HC 1999 02517	ween 7, pages 1A-1F,
20	16 	Dr. David R. Bentley, Oxford Gene Techno January 30, 2001, Lo	logy (QGT) v. A	pert Report of Dr. David Br Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1: Kingdom.	entley, in the Un 999 04645 and I	ited Kingdom li HC 1999 02517	tigation between , pages 1-17,
	17	Dr. David R. Bentley, Oxford Gene Technol January 30, 2001, Lo	logy (OGT) v. A	pert Report of Dr. David Be Affymetrix, case nos. HC 19 ingdom.	entley, in the Uni 1999 04645 and P	ited Kingdom lit KC 1999 02517	igation between , pages 1-2,
CAMINER		d B		DATE CONSIDERE	0 760.	7-	./

						Ma.	OIPE	7
Sheet 4 of 17			INFORMA	TION DISCLOSURE STATEME	NT	MAIL	200	包
FORM PTO 144		d) ARTMENT OF COMMERC	CE CE	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174	1	AL NO. 22,804	DELE O CHOOS	8
	OF REFEI	AND TRADEMARK OFFIC RENCES CITED BY APPLICA		APPLICANT Edwin Southern			PADEMARK	EZ
Date		everal sheets if necessary) ed to PTO: December 20,	2005	FILING DATE October 22, 1999		GROUP 1631		
			U.	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS	V			
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DA APPROPE	
								
-			FORE	EIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS				
		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLA YES	TION NO
								*
		OTHER	DOCIMENT/S) //	ncluding Author, Title, Date, Pert				
pellare	20	Dr. David R. Bentley Oxford Gene Technol January 30, 2001, Lo	Annex 5 to Exploracy (OGT) v.	expert Report of Dr. David Affymetrix, case nos. HC Kingdom. Expert Report of Dr. David Affymetrix, case nos. HC	Bentley, in the U	Jnited Kingdom I d HC 1999 0251	7, pages 1-2, litigation betw 7, pages 1-4,	een
70	21	Dr. David R. Bentley, Oxford Gene Technol January 30, 2001, Lo	rugy (OGT) v. A	pert Report of Dr. David & Affymetrix, case nos. HC (ingdom.	Bentley, in the U 1999 04645 and	Inited Kingdom li I HC 1999 02517	tigation betwe 7, pages 1-8,	en
	22	Dr. David R. Bentley, Oxford Gene Technol January 30, 2001, Lo	OGY (OG 1) V. A	pert Report of Dr. David E Affymetrix, case nos. HC ingdom.	Bentley, in the U 1999 04645 and	nited Kingdom li HC 1999 02517	tigation betwe	en
	23	Dr. David R. Bentley, Oxford Gene Technolo January 30, 2001, Lor	OGY (UG1) V. A	pert Report of Dr. David B Iffymetrix, case nos. HC 1 ingdom.	entley, in the Ui 1999 04645 and	ited Kingdom lit HS 1999 02517	igation between, pages 1-6,	en
AMINER		B. Brug		DATE CONSIDER	EO F G O	2		

						A.	SPE	=
Sheet 5 of 17			INFORM	ATION DISCLOSURE STATEM	ENT	Mark	Olre &	Ψ-
FORM PTO 1448		d) ARTMENT OF COMMERC	Œ	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174	SERIAL 09/42	- 140.	Dec 18905	4
	OF REFER	AND TRADEMARK OFFIC RENCES CITED BY APPLICA		APPLICANT Edwin Southern		A	CA	
Date		everal sheets if necessary) ed to PTO: December 20,	2005	FILING DATE October 22, 1999		GROUP 1631	TRABER OF THE PROPERTY OF THE	
			U	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS				
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE APPROPRU	
							· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
		T	FOR	EIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS		1		
		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATII YES	00 00
		OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (Including Author, Title, Date, Per	tingst Pages Sto l			
	24					Inited IC - 1	tiat	
	24	Oxford Gene Techni January 30, 2001, L	ology (OGT) v.	expert Report of Dr. David Affymetrix, case nos. HC Kingdom.	3 1999 04645 and	inited Kingdom I HC 1999 0251	itigation betwe 7, pages 1-12,	en
	25	Dr. David R. Bentley Oxford Gene Technol January 30, 2001, Lo	plogy (OGT) v.	Expert Report of Dr. Davi Affymetrix, case nos. HC Kingdom.	d Bentley, in the 1999 04645 and	United Kingdom I HC 1999 0251	litigation betw 7, pages 1-14,	 ee
	26	Dr. David R. Bentley Oxford Gene Techno January 30, 2001, Lo	ology (OGT) _v v.	Expert Report of Dr. David Affymetrix, case nos. HC Kingdom.	d Bentley, in the t 1999 04645 and	Jnited Kingdom HC 1999 0251	litigation between 1-5,	 e
uleske	27	Dr. David R. Bentley, Oxford Gene Techno January 30, 2001, Lo	ology (OGT) v.	Expert Report of Dr. David Affymetrix, case nos. HC Kingdom.	d Bentley, in the U 1999 04645 and	Jnited Kingdom HC 1999 02517	litigation betwe 7, pages 1-6,	er
70 00	28	Dr. David R. Bentley, Oxford Gene Techno January 30, 2001, Lo	logy (OGT) v	Expert Report of Dr. David Affymetrix, case nos. HS Kingdom.	Bentley, in the U 1999 04645 and	Inited Kingdom HC 1999 02517	litigation betwe	en
	29	Dr. David R. Bentley, Oxford Gene Technol January 30, 2001, Lo	logy (OGT) v. /	expert Report of Dr. David Affymetrix, case nos. HC Kingdom.	Bentley, in the U 1999 04645 and	Inited Kingdom I HC 1999 02517	litigation betwe , pages 1-8,	en
	30	Dr. David R. Bentley, Oxford Gene Technolo January 30, 2001, Lor	ogy (OGT) v. A	xpert Report of Dr. David Affymetrix, case nos. HC ingdom.	Bentley, in the U 1999 04645 and I	nited Kingdom I HC 1999 02517	itigation between pages 1-4,	-n
AINER		M. Brus			ED S Colo		/	_

								Au -		
Sheet 6 of 17			INFORMA	ATION DISC	LOSURE STATEME	NT		MAII	IPE	
FORM PTO 144		d) ARTMENT OF COMMERCI	E	ATTY D 99_11	OCĶET NO. 74		ERIAL NO. 19/422,80	•	PATE	8
	OF REFE	AND TRADEMARK OFFICE RENCES CITED BY APPLICAN		APPLIC Edwin	ANT Southern			138	DEC 3 MEN	YE.
Date		everal sheets if necessary) ed to PTO: December 20, 2	2005	FILING Octobe	DATE er 22, 1999			ROUP 1631	THADE	
			U.	S. PATENT	DOCUMENTS					
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE		NAME	CLAS	ss :	SUBCLASS	FILING DAT	
			FOR	EICH BATE	ALT DOCUMENTS	1				
		DOCUMENT		EIGN PATE	NT DOCUMENTS	1		T		
		NUMBER	DATE		COUNTRY	CLAS	S S	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATI YES	NO NO
		OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (I	Including Au	ıthor, Title, Date, Perti	inent Pages, E	tc.)			
	31	Dr. David R. Bentley Oxford Gene Techno January 30, 2001, Lo	ology (OGT) v.	Affymeti	ix, case nos, HC	d Bentley, ir 1999 0464	n the Unit 5 and HC	ed Kingdom 2 1999 0251	n litigation betv 7, pages 1-38	veen
	32	Dr. David R. Bentley, Oxford Gene Techno January 30, 2001, De	ilogy (OGT) v.	Affymetr	ix, case nos. HC	l Bentley, in 1999 0464	n the Unit 5 and H(ed Kingdom C 1999 025	n litigation betw 17, pages 1-4,	veen
	33	Dr. David R. Bentley, Oxford Gene Techno January 30, 2001, Lo	logy (OGT) v.	Affymetr	ix, case nos, HC	Bentley, in 1999 04645	the Unito	ed Kingdom 1999 0251	litigation betw 7, pages 1-2,	reen
nubles	34	Dr. David R. Bentley, Oxford Gene Technol January 30, 2001, Lo	logy (OGT) v	Affymelti	x, case nos. HC 1	Bentley, in 1999 04645	the Unite	ed Kingdom 1999 0251	litigation betw 7, pages 1-4,	een
no	35	Prof. Wolfgang Pfleid Technology (OGT) v. 19, 2001, Konstanz, (Affymetrix, ca:	eport and se nos. H	d Annex 1, in the IC 1999 04645 a	United King nd HC 1999	gdom litig 9 02517,	pation betwe pages 1-40	en Oxford Ger and 1-2, Janu	ne ary
	36	Dr. David B. Wallace, between Oxford Gene 1-55, January 18, 200	: Technology (OGT) v	Affymetrix, case r	, P.E., PH.I nos. NC 199	D., in the 99 04645	United King and HC 19	dom litigation 99 02517, pag	jes
	37	Dr. David B. Wallace, litigation between Oxfo pages 1-25, January 1	ora Gene Tecr	nnology (OGT) v. Attymetri	en Wallace ix, case nos	, P.E., PI s. HC 199	H.D., in the 99 04645 ar	United Kingdor ad HC 1999 02	 m :517,
	38	Dr. David B. Wallace, litigation between Oxfo pages 1-24, January 1	ora Gene Tech	inology (i	JGT) v. Affvmetri	en Wallace, ix, case nos	, P.E., PH s. HC 199	f.D., in the U	Jnited Kingdon d HC 1999 02	n 517,
AMINED	<u> </u>	11 13								
CAMINER	W	3. Druses			DATE CONSIDERE	0 56	2/200	1.1. H	206	- 1

Sheet 7 of 17			INFORMA	ATION DISCLOSURE STATEMEN	ıT			
FORM PTO 144	·	d) ARTMENT OF COMMERC	CE C	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174	SERIAL 09/422		OIPE	40
F	PATENT A	AND TRADEMARK OFFIC RENCES CITED BY APPLICA	E	APPLICANT Edwin Southern		h	AAEL 2DA	81
Date	-	ed to PTO: December 20,	2005	FILING DATE October 22, 1999		7	TRADEM	Str. Co.
			U.	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS				
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING D APPROP	
			FORE	EIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS				
		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSL/ YES	ATION NO
		OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (I	ncluding Author, Title, Date, Pertir	nent Pages, Etc.)		-	
	40	Prof. Edwin M. South Detween Oxford, United Kings	xford Gene Tec November 22, in thern, First Witne Technology tom.	of Dr. Paul Hyman Silverman chnology (OGT) v. Affymet 2000, Irvine, California. Dess Statement of Edwin M (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case of MS-1 to First Witness State	rix, case nos. Ho	in the United k	and HC 1999 Kingdom litiga 1-10, May 1, 2	02517, tion 0000,
pulleria	43	Prof. Edwin M. South	ern, Exhibit EN	AS-2 to First Witness State Gene Technology (OGT) v	ement of Edwin M	Mellor Souther	n in the Units	ed
no	44	Prof. Edwin M. South Kingdom litigation bel pages 1-58, May 1, 20	tween Oxford (IS-3 to First Witness State Gene Technology (OGY) v. nited Kingdom.	ment of Edwin N Affymetrix, case	fellor Souther e nos. HC 199	n, in the Unite 9 04645,	:d
	45	Prof. Edwin M. Southe between Oxford Gene 2001, Oxford, United I	: Technology ((ess Statement of Edwin Me OGT) v. Affymetrix, case n	ellor Southern, in os. HC 1999 046	the United Ki 645, pages 1-1	ngdom litigati 13, January 2	on 2,
	46	Prof. Edwin M. Southe litigation between Oxfo 22, 2001, Oxford, Unit	ord Gene Tech	Fifth Witness Statement on nology (OGT) v. Affymetrio	of Edwin Mellor S k, case nos. HC	Southern, in th 1999 04645, p	e United King pages 1-7, Jar	dom nuary
AMINER	LL	MK Chi		DATE CONSIDERE	0 560	A (1 A (1)	2.16	

						- 'MA		
- Sheet 8 of 17			INFORM	ATION DISCLOSURE STATEME	NT	7/1/9	40	
FORM PTO 144	·	o) ARTMENT OF COMMERC	F	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174	SERIA 09/42	L NO.	C 250 2005 W	
Р	ATENT A	AND TRADEMARK OFFIC RENCES CITED BY APPLICAL	E	APPLICANT Edwin Southern		BARA	TRADENET	
Date		everal sheets if necessary) ed to PTO: December 20, 2	2005	FILING DATE October 22, 1999	1			
			į.	J.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS				
'EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE	
			FOR	REIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS		1 -1		
 .		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES NO	
		OTHER .	DOCUMENT(S)	(Including Author, Title, Date, Pert	tinent Pages, Etc.)		- w w w w w w w w w w w w w w w w w w w	
	47	Peter Jay Coassin, N Oxford Gene Techno Fullenon, California.	ology (OGT) v	ment of Peter Jay Coassin r. Affymetrix, case nos. HC	n, in the United h 1999 02517, pa	Kingdom litigation ages 1-4, Januar	n between y 22, 2001,	
	48	Dr. Timothy S. Fell, I Oxford Gene Technol United Kingdom.	Witness State plogy (OGT) v	ment of Timothy Stephen . Affymetrix, case nos. HC	Fell, in the Unite 1999 02517, pa	d Kingdom litiga iges 1-11, Janua	ntion between ary 18, 2001, Oxford,	
, k	49	Dr. Timothy S. Fell, A between Oxford Gen Oxford, United Kingd	e Technology	tness Statement of Timoth (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case	y Stephen Fell, nos. HC 1999 (in the United Kir 12517, pages 1-5	ngdom litigation 5, January 18, 2001,	
nelles	50	Dr. Timothy S. Fell, A between Oxford Gen- Oxford, United Kingd	e Technology	tness Statement of Timoth (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case	y Stephen Fell, nos. HC 1999 0	in the United Kin 2517, pages 1-6	gdom litigation , January 18, 2001,	
no	51	Dr. Timothy S. Fell, A between Oxford Gene Oxford, United Kingdo	e Technology	iness Statement of Timothy (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case	y Stephen Fell, i nos. HC 1999 0	n the United Kin 2517, pages 1-8	gdom litigation , January 18, 2001,	
	52	Dr. Timothy S. Fell, A between Oxford Gene 2001, Oxford, United	e Technology	ness Statement of Timothy (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case	y Stephen Fell, i nos. HC 1999 0	n the United Kin 2517, pages 1-1	gdom litigation 1, January 18,	
	53	Dr. Timothy S. Fell, A between Oxford Gene Oxford, United Kingdo	: Technology	ness Statement of Timothy (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case i	y Stephen Fell, i nos. HC 1999 0	n the United King 2517, pages 1-2	gdom litigation , January 18, 2001,	
	54	Dr. Timothy S. Fell, And between Oxford Gene 2001, Oxford, United I	Technology (ness Statement of Timothy (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case r	Stephen Fell, in nos. HC 1999 02	n the United King 2517, pages 1-11	odom litigation 1, January 18,	
XAMINER	1	&. Bruse		DATE CONSIDER	FD 560	0	201/	

			1					
• Sheet 9 of 17			INFORMA	TION DISCLOSURE STATEMEN	T	An		
FORM PTO 1449) RTMENT OF COMMERC	F	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174	SERIAL 09/422		OPE	
P/	ATENT A	IND TRADEMARK OFFIC	E	APPLICANT Edwin Southern			DEC 20 2005	
Date		veral sheets if necessary) d to PTO: December 20, 2	2005	FILING DATE GROUP October 22, 1999 1631				
			U.	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS				
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE	
	k		FORE	EIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS	L	<u> </u>		
		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES NO	
		OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (II	ncluding Author, Title, Date, Pertin	ent Pages, Etc.)	!	 	
Miche	55	Stewart L. Huxley, V	Vitness Statem	ent of Stewart Leonard Hu Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1	xley, in the Unite	ed Kingdom litiq es 1-2, Januar	gation between y 8, 2001, Oxford,	
ou ou	56	Martin G. Johnson, N Oxford Gene Techno United Kingdom.	Witness Staten ology (OGT) v.	nent of Martin George John Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1	nson, in the Unit 1999 02517, pag	ed Kingdom lit es 1-7, Januar	igation between y 19, 2001, Oxford	
Jes	57	Ekins R., "Multi-analy 155-168, 1989.	yte immunoass	ay", Journal of Pharmaceu	itical & Biomedic	cal Analysis, Vo	o. 7, No. 2, pp.	
Sto	58	Kimura et al., "An Im 4, pp. 41-52, 1988.	mobilized Enzy	vme Membrane Fabrication	n Method using a	ın ink Jet Nozz	le", Biosensors, V	
SE	59	Geysen et al., "Strate 102, pp. 259-274, 19	egies for epitop 87.	e analysis using peptide s	ynthesis", Journa	al of Immunolo	gical Methods, Vo	
18/2	60	Monaco et al., "Huma p. 90, 1989.	an Genome Lin	king With Cosmids and Ye	east Artificial Chr	omosomes", a	bstract from CSHS	
o brough	63	Or. Edwig Southern, 9 0 619 321, pp. 1-17, 0	Statutory Decla Oct. 1999, Kidli	ration of Dr. Edwin Southe ington, United Kingdom.	ern, in the Oppos	ition Proceedir	ngs against EP No	
Sh	64	Ekins R., "Why we sh on Molecular Probes:	ould move tow Technology ar	ards non-isotopic immunoand Medical Applications, pp	assay?", Presen o. 1-22, April 11-	tation at Interna 13, 1988, Flore	ational Symposiun ence, Italy.	
JB	65	Lysov et al., "A New N Oligonucleotides", Do	Method for Dete klady Biochem	ermining the DNA Nucleotic istry, Vol. 303, pp. 436-438	de Sequence by 3, Nov-Dec 1988	Hybridization v	vith	
XAMINER	Jul	5. Buist		DATE CONSIDEREI	0 5 Faline	acon 2006		

			INFORMA	TION DISCLOSURE STATE	MENT	Ma	OIPE
FORM PTO 144	•	a) ARTMENT OF COMMERCE		ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174		RIAL NO. 1/422,804	OF TORSON
	OF REFER	AND TRADEMARK OFFICE RENCES CITED BY APPLICANT(: everal sheets if necessary)	S)	APPLICANT Edwin Southern		A. C.	
Date		ed to PTO: December 20, 200	5	FILING DATE October 22, 1999		GROUP 1631	MOEMAN
		<u> </u>	U.S	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS			
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE
		T	FORE	IGN PATENT DOCUMENTS		····	
		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES NO
		OTHER DOO	CUMENT(S) (Inc	cluding Author, Title, Date, P	ertinent Pages Etc.		
	66	Professor Edwin South litigation between Oxfor 2000, Kidlington, United	ern, Witness d Gene Tec	Statement of Profess	or Edwin Mellor	Southern in the U	nited Kingdom p. 1-40, January
	67	Bird and Bird. Notice of Gene Technology, pp. 1	Opposition, -15, Oct. 19	in the Opposition Proc 99, London, United Kil	eedings agains ngdom.	t EP No. 0 619 321	filed by Oxford
. \$	68	Dr. Edwin Southern, Sta 0 619 321, pp. 1-17, Oc	itutory Decla 1 1999, Oxfo	aration of Dr. Edwin So ord, United Kingdom.	uthern, in the C	pposition Proceedi	ngs against EP N
ubla	69	Morris, Nichols, Arsht & States litigation between Delaware, CA No. 99-34	i Oxiora Ger	ne Technology (CGT) v	/ Attvmetrix II	econd Amended An S. District Court for	nswer, in the Unite the District of
No po	70	Dale Davis, Expert Repo v. Affymetrix, U.S. Distric Delaware.	ort of Dale Date Court for the	avis, in the United Stat he District of Delaware	es litigation bet , CA No. 99-34	ween Oxford Gene 8, pp. 1-37, August	Technology (OG 2000, Wilmingto
	71	Grant Morgan, Expert Re (OGT) v. Affymetrix, U.S. Atascadero, California.	eport of Gran District Cou	nt Morgan, in the Unite ourt for the District of De	d States litigation laware, CA No.	on between Oxford 99-348, pp. 1-15, /	Gene Technolog August 2000,
	72	Dr. Elias Corey, Expert R Technology (OGT) v. Affy 2000, Wilmington, Delaw	michix. U.S.	Elias James Corey, in District Court for the I	the United Stat Sistrict of Delaw	es litigation betwee rare, CA No. 99-348	en Oxford Gene 8, pp. 1-10, Augu
	1]	Dr. James Wolmus Evan	d Report of	Dr. James G. Wetmur	, in the United S	States litigation betw	ween Oxford Con
	73	Dr. James Wetmur, Expe Technology (OGT) v. Affy 2000, Wilmington, Delaw	mema, o.s.	District Court for the D	District of Delaw	are, CA No. 99-348	3, pp. 1-29, Augu
	73	Tourising (COT) 4. Mily	unnell, Mem y Judgment metrix, U.S.	norandum of Points and tof Validity, in the Unit District Court for the D	d Authorities In	are, CA No. 99-348 Support of Affymetr	3, pp. 1-29, Augu

<u> </u>							<u> </u>
Sheet 11 of 17			INFORMA	TION DISCLOSURE STATEME	NT	94	MOIPE
FORM PTO 1449		ஏ) ARTMENT OF COMMERC	Œ	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174	SERIA 09/42		OF CON THE S
	OF REFE	AND TRADEMARK OFFIC RENCES CITED BY APPLICA		APPLICANT Edwin Southern			
Date		everal sheets if necessary) ed to PTO: December 20,	2005	FILING DATE October 22, 1999		GROUP 1631	ADEMA
			U.	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS			
EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE
			FORE	SICM BATENT DOCUMENTS			
		DOCUMENT	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TO 4 100 4 7 10 14
	-	NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES NO
		OTHER	DOCUMENTACY (C)	ncluding Author, Title, Date, Pert			
	75	Di James Wetmur, Summary Judgment	Declaration of of Validity, in t	James G. Wetmur in Sup he United States litigation e District of Delaware, CA	port of Affymetri	d Gene Technol	logy (OGT) v
	76	Dr. James Wetmur, Oxford Gene Techno 1-45, September 200	ology (OGT) v	I Report of Dr. James G. Affyrnetrix, U.S. District C alifornia.	Wetmur, in the Uourt for the Distr	Inited States liti	igation between , CA No. 99-348, pp.
٤.	77	Dr. Martin Adelman Technology (OGT) v 2000, Washington, D	Affymetrix, U.S	- Martin J. Adelman, in the S. District Court for the Di	e United States I strict of Delawar	itigation betwee e, CA No. 99-34	en Oxford Gene 48, pp. 1-16, August
pulle	78	Summary Judgment	of Validity, in th	Elias James Corey in Supple United States litigation by District of Delaware, CA	between Oxford	Gene Technological	any (OGT) y
200	79	Pretrial Order Exhibit Affymetrix, U.S. Distri Delaware.	s 1-5 and 12-13 ict Court for the	in the United States litig District of Delaware, CA	gation between (No. 99-348, pp.	Oxford Gene Te 1-110, October	chnology (OGT) v. 2000, Wilmington,
	80	Transcript of Markma Affymetrix, U.S. Distri Delaware.	n Hearing, in th ct Court for the	ne United States litigation District of Delaware, CA	between Oxford No. 99-348, pp.	Gene Technolo 1-149, October	ogy (OGT) v. 2000, Wilmington,
Jes Jes	81	Wada A., Abstracts of Sequencing, pp. 2-11	Presentations July 7-9, 1987	at International Worksho , Okayama, Japan.	p on Automatic	and High Speed	I DNA Base
JB	82	Wallace et al., "Hybric base pair mismatch",	lization of synth Nucleic Acids F	netic oligodeoxyribonucle Research, Vol. 6, No. 11,	otides to phi and pp. 3543-3557,	174 DNA: the 6	effect of single
JB	83	Uwe Maskos, "A nove Oxford, pp. 2-161, Nev	I method of nuc w College, Oxfo	cleic acid sequence analy ord, 1991.	sis", Maskos The	esis submitted t	o University of
MINER	Jo	S. Gruser		DATE CONSIDERE	5 Febru	mu 2006	
	71					- 1000	

Sheet 12 of 17			INFORMA	ATION DISC	LOSURE STATEMEN	IT	A	9	
FORM PTO 1449		ARTMENT OF COMMERC		1 .	OCKET NO.	SERIA	NL NO. 22,804	A O O P E	40
PA	ATENT A	AND TRADEMARK OFFIC RENCES CITED BY APPLICA	E	APPLIC Edwin	ANT Southern			DEC 2 00	185 JUS
Date		ed to PTO: December 20, 2	2005	FILING I	DATE er 22, 1999		GROUP . 1631	THAPBY	of C
			U.	S. PATENT	DOCUMENTS			7	
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE		NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING D APPROP	
			FORE	EIGN PATE	NT DOCUMENTS	T			
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE		COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSL YES	ATION NO
	<u></u>								
		OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (II	ncluding Au	thor, Title, Date, Pertin	ent Pages, Etc.)			
XB	84	Bannworth, W. et al. Support", DNA, Vol.	, "A System for 5, No. 5, pp. 4	r the Sim 13-419,	ultaneous Chemio 1986.	cal Synthesis o	of Different DNA	\ Fragments o	n Solid
J83	85	Lohrmann, R. et al., Research, p. 122, 19	"New Solid Su 184.	pports fo	r DNA Synthesis",	, Fourth Annua	Il Congress for	Recombinant	DNA
JSB	87	Goldkorn, T. et al., "A Application for hybrid Research, Vo. 14, No.	lization-restrict	ion analy	sis and for in vitro	for covalent att synthesis of [achment of DN DNA probes", N	A to cellulose ucleic Acids	;
183	88	Duncan, C. et al., "Af Oligonucleotides", Ar	finity Chromato nalytical Bioche	ography (emistry, \	of a Sequence-sp /o. 169, pp. 104-1	ecific DNA Bin 08, 1988.	ding Protein Us	ing Teflon-lin	ked
16	89	Voss et al., "A simple matrix", Biochemical	and efficient n Society Transa	nethod fo	or covalently attac 65th meeting, Lor	hing oligonuck ndon, pp. 367-	eotides to a cell 368, 1987.	ulose support	
165	90	Nicholls, P. et al., "Nu Vol. 3, pp. 122-135, 1	ıcleic Acid Ana 989.	llysis by S	Sandwich Hybridiz	ation", Journa	l of Clinical Lab	oratory Analy	sis,
163	91	Wallace, R. et al., "Th oligonucleotides of mi 879-894, 1981.	e use of synth xed sequence	etic oligo to rabbit	nucleotides as hy beta-globin DNA"	bridization pro , Nucleic Acid	bes. II. Hybridiz s Research, Vo	ration of I. 9, No. 4, pp	
7	92	File wrapper of S.N. 0	7/593 580 000	ı abanda	ned Cilia	Late 021	October 199	10 D. LL.	and in
no copy.	ref	et.al.	7,000,000 NOW	audituo	THING .			, vairug	7,00
JB	93	File wrapper of S.N. O.	7/772,625 mate 04 october	uring into	US 5,348,855 on	September 1	994 to Dattagur	ota et al. ,	
XAMINER .	Jour	5. Brusco			DATE CONSIDERED	I Felo	Lugin 7	001	

						· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	POILE
Sheet 13 of 17			INFORMA	TION DISCLOSURE STATEMEN	т		10gm 4
FORM PTO 1449		ග) ARTMENT OF COMMERC	:E	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174	SERIAL 09/42		DEC 2 072005
P	ATENT . OF REFEI	AND TRADEMARK OFFIC RENCES CITED BY APPLICAI	E	APPLICANT Edwin Southern			TRABEMANT
Date		everal sheets if necessary) ed to PTO: December 20, 2	2005	FILING DATE October 22, 1999		GROUP 1631	
			U.	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS			
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE
			FORE	EIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS			
		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES NO
		OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (#	ncluding Author, Title, Date, Pertin	ent Pages, Etc.)		-
Jes	94	1	new linkage for	solid phase synthesis of c		", Nucleic Acid	s Research, Vol. 13,
HB	95	Kremsky, J. et al., "Ir at the 5' terminus", N	mmobilization of lucleic Acids R	of DNA via oligonucleotide esearch, Vol. 15, No. 7, pp	s containing an b. 2891-2909, 19	aldehyde or ca 987.	arboxylic acid group
NS	96	Wolf, S. et al., "Rapid Research, Vol. 15, N	d hybridization o. 7, pp. 2911-	kinetics of DNA attached t 2926, 1987.	o submicron late	ex particles", N	lucleic Acids
JB .	97	Atkinson, T., "A conve of mRNA", Nucleic Ad	enient procedu cids Research,	re for the synthesis of olig Vol. 16, No. 13, p. 6232,	odeoxyribonucle 1988.	eotide affinity o	columns for isolation
0	99	Court Transcript of Te v. Mergen Ltd et al., t Wilmington, Delaware	J.S. District Co	orial, in the United States li ourt for the District of Delaw	ligation betweer rare, CA No. 02	Oxford Gene -1695, pp. 1-72	Technology (OGT) 2, December 2003,
hor	100	Blank Rome LNP, OG (OGT) v. Mergen Nd of 2003, Wilmington, De	et al., U.S. Dist	y Tutorial, in the United State trict Court for the District of	ates litigation be f Delaware, CA	tween Oxford No. 02-1695, p	Gene Technology op. 1-28, December
no publisho	101	States inigation betwe	en Oxford Gen	n, Ltd.'s Slide Presentation te Technology (OGT) v. Me 11, December 2003, Wilm	ergen I td et al	U.S. District C	utorial, in the United ourt for the District
no p	102	Patton Boggs LLP, De the United States litiga	efendant Clonte	ech Laboratories Slide Pre Oxford Gene Technology (695, pp. 1-33, December)	sentation for the	December 18	, 2003 Tutorial, in District Court for
	103	Kirkland & Ellis LLP, L	etter to Perkins Technology (O	s Coie LLP enclosing OGT	's Claim Terms	in the United S	States litigation ct of Delaware, CA
AMINER	Jo?	S. Bruset		DATE CONSIDERED	5 Felu	using 20	16
•						/ <u></u>	

Sheet 14 of 17			, 					2.	
			INFORMA	TION DISCLOSURE STATEME	NT	Γ		PE	\
FORM PTO 14	U.S. DEP	ARTMENT OF COMMERC	E	99_1174		SERIAL 09/422		ALE.	88 P8
	T OF REFE	AND TRADEMARK OFFIC RENCES CITED BY APPLICA		APPLICANT Edwin Southern			¥	DEC 3 Q SO	
Dat		everal sheets if necessary) ed to PTO: December 20,	2005	FILING DATE October 22, 1999			GROUP 1631	PABEN	
·			U.	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS			· * 	·	
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CI	ASS	SUBCLASS	FILING D APPROF	
~~···									
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		-	FORE	IGN PATENT DOCUMENTS			•		
		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CL	ASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSL YES	ATION NO
P									
		OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (II	ncluding Author, Title, Date, Pert	Inent Pages	E(c)	<u> </u>	L	<u> </u>
	104	Perkins Coie LLP, M between Oxford Ger	lergen Ltd.'s Cl ne Technology	aim Terms and Proposed (OGT) v. Mergen Ltd et a enlo Park, California.	l Constau	ction in	the United Sta ourt for the Dis	ates litigation strict of Delaw	vare, CA
	105	Dr. Paul Pyrdue, Exp Gene Technology (C pp. 1-10, May 2004,	i v. Merden	Paul Edward Purdue Ph.D Ltd et al., U.S. District Co)., in the lourt for th	United S ne Distric	tates litigation	between Oxi , CA No. 02-1	lord 1695,
	106	Dr. Paul Purdue, Exp Gene Technology (O pp. 1-13, June 2004	(Ci) v. Mergen	Paul Edward Purdue Ph.D Ltd et al., U.S. District Co)., in the tourt for th	Jnited Sie Distric	tates litigation at of Delaware,	between Oxf , CA No. 02-1	ord 695,
15 Ker	107	I recimology Ltd 5 Fits	Mergen Ltd et	efendant Mergen Ltd.'s Th Set of Interrogatories, in t al., U.S. District Court for	he Uniter	1 States	litigation both	ann Outred C	`~~~
gad .	108	L permeen oxioin gent	s recunology (nnology Ltd.'s Claim Cons OGT) v. Mergen Ltd et al. Vilmington, Delaware.	struction I	Brief, in strict Co	the United Sta urt for the Dist	ites litigation rict of Delawa	are, CA
20	109	nigation between Oxi	ora Gene Tech	rgen Limited's Opening C nology (OGT) v. Mergen , July 2004, Wilmington,	l ld et al	IIS Di	n Brief, in the t strict Court for	United States	of
	110	litigation between Oxfe	ord Gene Tech	rgen Limited's Reply in St Patent NO 6,054,270 Pt nology (OG 1) v. Mergen t August 2004, Wilmington	ırsuant to I td et al	35 U.S	C 442 :- 46-	11-3-10-4	
	111	Pursuant to 35 U.S.C.	or Summary Ju 112, in the Uni	claration of Norbert Stahl in degment of Invalidity of Clated States litigation between of Delaware, CA No. 03	aim 1 of 0	United S	tates Patent N	10. 6,054,270)
AMINER		& Bruser	.	DATE CONSIDERE	\			,/-	

<u> </u>					,	MA	OE 40
Sheet 15 of 17			INFORMA	ATION DISCLOSURE STATEMEN	NT .	7/	
FORM PTO 1449	-	d) ARTMENT OF COMMERC	εE	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174	SERIA 09/42		CEC BO JON BE
	OF REFE	AND TRADEMARK OFFIC RENCES CITED BY APPLICA		APPLICANT Edwin Southern			AMENE A TRADE
Date		everal sheets if necessary) ed to PTO: December 20,	2005	FILING DATE October 22, 1999		GROUP 1631	
			U.	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS			
*EXAMINER INITIAL	-	DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			FORE	EIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS	r	1	1
	-	DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES NO
	Т	i (ncluding Author, Title, Date, Pertin Chnology's Claim Construc			
	113	Order and Memorand between Oxford Gen	rt for the Distriction of the Technology (States litigation between ct of Delaware, CA No. 02- f the U.S. District Court on (OGT) v. Mergen Ltd et al.	Claim Construct	3, August 2004	, Wilmington,
(114	Order and Memorand	tum Opinion of	the U.S. District Court on	re. Expert Reports	in the United	States litination
~		No. 02-1695, pp. 1-2	3, November 2	OGT) v. Mergen Ltd et al., 004, Wilmington, Delaward	e.	ourt for the Dist	inct of Delaware, CA
6/13	115	I nerween Oxidia Gette	e recumology (the U.S. District Court on OGT) v. Mergen Ltd et al., 004, Wilmington, Delaware	U.S. District Co	ment, in the Un ourt for the Dist	nited States litigation rict of Delaware, CA
nd on	116	States litigation between	en Oxford Ger	ergen Limited's Motion for fed's Motion for Partial Sum Ne Technology (OGT) v. Mi 18 December 2004, Wilm	mary Judgmeni ergen I td et al	of Infringemer	at in the Heited
	117	Reconsideration, in th	e United States	nnology Limited's Oppositions litigation between Oxford Delaware, CA No. 02-1695	Gene Technologic	M v (COC) voc	largon Ltd at at
	118	Oddita Graci, in the O	inted States III	gen Limited's Reply in Sur igation between Oxford Ge are, CA No. 02-1695, pp.	ine Lechnology	(OGD v Mero	antidatal IIC I
	119	Blank Rome LLP, Lette Technology (OGT) v. M January 2005, Wilming	reruen Liu et a	dan re claim terms, in the	United States life District of Del	igation betwee aware, CA No.	n Oxford Gene 02-1695, pp. 1-2,
AMINER	10	B. Bruses		DATE CONSIDERED	5 Fale	wary 20	06

Sheet 16 of 17			INFORM	NATION DISCLOSURE ST	ATEMENT		An		
FORM PTO 1449	.S. DEP	ARTMENT OF COMMERC	Œ	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174		SERIAI 09/42		ODA.	40,5
	OF REFE	AND TRADEMARK OFFIC RENCES CITED BY APPLICA Overal sheets if necessary)		APPLICANT Edwin Southern				DEC 200	
Date		ed to PTO: December 20,	2005	FILING DATE October 22, 1999			GROUP 1631	STERE THE	of M
	г			J.S. PATENT DOCUMENT	s				
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME		CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DA	
	i		FOR	EIGN PATENT DOCUMEN	ure	·			
		DOCUMENT	DATE	COUNTRY			T		-
	-	NUMBER		COMINI		CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLA YES	NO NO
(_ <u></u>	OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (Including Author, Title, Dat	e, Pertinent Page	es, Etc.)			· <u>-</u>
Capital	120	Order of the U.S. Dis	strict Court on plogy (OGT) v	Mergen's Motion for	Reconsidera	tion in th	e United States e District of De	s litigation bel laware, CA N	ween lo.
ASS	121	Khrapko, K. et al., "A pp. 118-122, Octobe	n oligonucleo			A sequen	cing", FEBS, V	ol. 256, Nos.	1-2,
25/2/6	122	Potter Anderson & C. First Set of Interrogal International et al., U Wilmington, Delaward	S. District Co						
JO	123	Polsky-Cynkin, R. et a Hybridization", Clinica	al., "Use of DN al Chemistry, \	VA Immobilized on PI Vol. 31, No. 9, pp. 14	astic and Aga 38-1443, 198	arose Sup 15.	oports to Detec	t DNA by San	ndwich
ζ.	124	Michael Best & Friedr litigation between Oxf District of Illinois, CA	ord Ochie rec	HINDROUV CONSTITUTION	torola inc i	l C I links	of Count to a store	the United St Northeastern	ates
10 publishe	125	Brinks Hofer Bilson & Gene Technology (OC 02-9344, pp. 1-39, Jan	Lione, Motoro	ola's Response Markr	non Priof in	tha I laite	4.04.4. (51) 15	on between C linois, CA No	xford
nd ou	126	Brinks Hofer Gilson & between Oxford Gene Illinois, CA No. 02-934				hibits A-Z	, the United Sta or the Northeas	ales litigation stern District o	of .
	127	Brinks Hofer Gilson & between Oxford Gene Illinois, CA No. 02-934				nibits A(1)	G(1), the Unit	ed States litig tern District o	ation f
		Brinks Hofer Gilson & L between Oxford Gene Illinois, CA No. 02-9344	ione, Motorol Technology (C	a's Response Markm	an Brief, Exh	ibits 1-3, t Court fo	the United Stater the Northeast	tes litigation tern District of	f
MNER	lod	. Gruns				6.1.	en 2026		

					1,		
Sheet 17 of 17			INFORM	ATION DISCLOSURE STATEME	NT	A	PE 40
FORM PTO 14	•	a) ARTMENT OF COMMERC	:F	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174		AL NO. 22,804	2015002 R
	PATENT	AND TRADEMARK OFFIC RENCES CITED BY APPLICA	E	APPLICANT Edwin Southern		/3	DEC CO
Dat		everal sheets if necessary) ed to PTO: December 20,	2005	FILING DATE October 22, 1999		GROUP 1631	THE STATE OF THE PARTY OF THE P
			U	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS			
'EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE
							· ; •
			FOR	EIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS			<u> </u>
		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES NO
		OTHER	DOCUMENT(S)	Including Author, Title, Date, Perti	nent Pages, Etc.)	1	<u> </u>
	129	Michael Best & Fried	drich LLP, OG OGT) v. Motoro	T's Reply to Markman Briel ola, Inc., U.S. District Court	f. in the United	States litigation astern District of	between Oxford f Illinois, CA No.
	130	Michael Best & Fried Technology (OGT) v. pp. 1-10, March 2004	. Motorola, Inc	rs Exhibit A Claim Chart, in U.S. District Court for the nois.	n the United Si e Northeastern	ates litigation be District of Illinois	etween Oxford Gene s, CA No. 02-9344,
	131	Michael Best & Fried Technology (OGT) v. pp. 1-139, March\200	. Motorola, Inc	's Exhibit 1-9, in the United ., U.S. District Court for the linois.	d States litigati e Northeastern	on between Oxfo District of Illinois	ord Gene s, CA No. 02-9344,
1,51.6	132	Michael Best & Fried Technology (OGT) v. pp. 1-222, March 200	∖Motorola, Inc.	's Exhibit H-R, in the Unite , U.S. District Court for the inois.	ed States litigat Northeastern	ion between Oxf District of Illinois	ord Gene s, CA No. 02-9344,
11900	133	Civil Docket for CA N Delaware, pp. 1-36, A	o. 99-0348, O. April 2005, Wil	xford Gene Technology (O mington, Delaware.	GT) v. Affymet	rix, Inc., U.S. Dis	strict Court for
011	134	Civil Docket for CA No Delaware, pp. 1-31, A	o. 02-1695, Ox April 2005, Wile	oford Gene Technology (Omington, Delaware.	GT) v. Mergen	, Ltd., U.S. Distri	ct Court for
	135	Civil Docket for CA No Court for Delaware, pp	p. 1-7, April 20	ford Gene Technology (Od 05, Wilmington, Delaware	GT) v. Teleche	m International,	Inc., U.S. District
	136	Civil Docket for CA No Delaware, pp. 1-5, Apr	o. 02-1687, Ox ril 2005, Wilmi	ford Gene Technology (OC ington, Delaware.	GT) v. Nanogei	n, Inc., U.S. Disti	rict Court for
	137	Civil Docket for CA No Northeastern District o	o. 02-9344, Ox of Illinois, pp. 1	ford Gene Technology (OC -4, April 2005, Chicago, Illi	GT) v. Motorola inois.	, Inc., U.S. Distri	ict Court for the
AMINER	1 K	Bruses		DATE CONSIDERE	0 560) 6 4 /	/

Sheet 1 of 13 ·			INFORM	ATION DISCLOSURE STATEMEN	NT			
FPREPTO 1449		RTMENT OF COMMERC		ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174	SE	RIAL NO. 1/422,804		
-C 0 8 2005 W	F REFER	NO TRADEMARK OFFICE	JE	APPLICANT Edwin SOUTHERN				-
TRADENS ate		veral sheets if necessary) ed to PTO: December 8,	2005	FILING DATE . October 22, 1999		GROUP 1631		
			U	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS				
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DAT APPROPRI	
JK()	AA	4,216,245	8/1980	Johnson	427	2		
NA	АВ	4,395,486	7/1983	Wilson et al.	435	6		
PD.	AC	4,563,419	1/1986	Ranki et al.	435	6		
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	FORE	EIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS				
1.2		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATI YES	NO NO
19(5	AD	0 235 726	9/1987	EP				
\$5	AE	0 171 150	2/1986	EP				
185	AF	85/0105 1	3/1985	wo				
183	AG	0 268 237	5/1988	EP				
	АН							
	· · · · · ·	OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (In	cluding Author, Title, Date, Pertin	ent Pages, Etc.)			
	Ai	Declaration from Rad	domir Crkvenja	kov (with four exhibits), Se	ptember 199	96.		
	ΑĴ	Declaration from Ivan	n Labat , Septe	mber 1996.				
i s	AK	Statement from the land	nstitute of Mole	cular Genetics and Geneti	c Engineerir	ng (IMGGE) in Belgr	ade, Septemb	er
nele	AL	Statement by Profess symposium, and a po	sor Roger Ekins est-published pa	s (with an abstract of a lect aper corresponding to said	ure given by lecture), De	rhim on 4/11/88 at a ecember 1996.	3	
20	АМ	Statutory Declaration	of Dr. Nichlola	s Vaughan Ashely (with Ex	chibit NVA1),	May 1995.		
ı	AN	Statutory Declaration	of Dr. William I	Bains (with Exhibits WB1, 1	WB2 and W	B3), May 1995.		
L AMINER	TH	Busa		DATE CONSIDERE		204/		

			:		 }		
Sheet 2 of 13			INFORM	ATION DISCLOSURE STATEMEN	NT		
FORM PTO 1449 U.	S. DEPAR	TMENT OF COMMER	RCE	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174		AL NO. 22,804	
	F REFEREI	O TRADEMARK OFF		APPLICANT Edwin SOUTHERN			
Date		to PTO: December 8	2005	FILING DATE October 22, 1999		GROUP 1631	
	- ,		U	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS			
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF
18/2	ВА	4,704,353	11/1987	Humphries et al.	435	4	
165	BB	4,327,073	4/1982	Huang	424	1	
Jon Jones	BC	4,728,502	3/1988	Hamill	422	116	
126	BD	5,002,867	3/1991	Macevicz	435	6	
<u>J</u>			FORE	IGN PATENT DOCUMENTS			
		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES NO
16/5	BE	88/01302	2/1988	wo			
Jes _	BF	86/03782	7/1986	wo			
Je B	BG	0 238 332	9/1987	EP			
Jeb	ВН	2 156 074	10/1985	GB			
165	BI	0 237 362	9/1987	EP			
<u> </u>		OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (In	cluding Author, Title, Date, Pertine	ant Pages, Etc.)		
	BJ (Declaration of Profe	ssor Lubert Stry	ver, January 1997.			
	вк ѕ	Statutory Declaration	n of Dr. William	Bains, January 1997.			
eshe	BL S	Statutory Declaration	n of Dr. Nicholas	s Vaughan Ashley, January	/ 1997.		
pul	вм р	eclaration of Edwin	Mellor Southern	n (with Exhibits EMS1 and	EMS2), Janua	ry 1998.	
n.	BN D	eclaration of Dr. Th	omas Gingaras,	January 1999.	444		
	BO D	eclaration of Profes	sor Calvin Quate	e, January 1999.		,	
INICO	1,17	χ .		\			,
INER	127 V	Jusis		DATE CONSIDERED	3 Falu	ualy 200 1	2

								
Sneet 3 of 13 .	 .		INFORM	ATION DISCLOSURE STATEME	NT			
FORM PTO 1448	.S. DEPAF	RTMENT OF COMMER	CE	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174		RIAL NO. 422,804		
P.	ATENT AI OF REFERE	ND TRADEMARK OFFI ENCES CITED BY APPLIC	CE	APPLICANT Edwin SOUTHERN				
Date		veral sheets if necessary) d to PTO: December 8,	2005	FILING DATE October 22, 1999		GROUP 1631		
	<u>,</u>		U.	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS				
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING E	
KB.	CA	5,202,231	4/1993	Drmanac et al.	435	6		
XC	СВ	5,474,796	12/1995	Brennan	427	2.13		
183	СС	5,429,807	7/1995	Matson et al.	422	131		
			FORE	EIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS				
		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSL YES	ATION NO
R/3	CD	89/11548	11/1989	wo				
183	CE	93/22480	11/1993	wo				
Jes	CF	0 386 229	9/1990	EP				
185	CG	0 281 927	9/1988	EP				
183	СН	0 130 739	1/1985	EP				
		OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (In	cluding Author, Title, Date, Pertin	ent Pages, Etc.)			
S	CI	Declaration of Dr. G	lenn Mc Gall, Ja	anuary 1999.				
alex	Cl	Declaration of Edwin	n Mellor Souther	rn, July 2001.				
33	СК	Bird & Bird, "Claimar Technology (OGT)	nt's Notice of Ex . Affymetrix, cas	periments", In the United I se no. HC 1999 02517, pp	Kingdom Litig	ation between Oxfo 1, 2000, London, L	ord Gene Inited King	dom.
	CL	Declaration of Marvir	n Stodolsky, Oct	tober 1996.				
865	1 .	M. S. Urdea et al., "A biological samples w human serum", Gene	ithout blotting of	for the rapid detection of spradioactivity; application pp. 253-264.	pecific nucleo to the analysis	tide sequences in s s of hepatitis B viru	crude es in	
Jess	CN C	C. G. Miyada et al., "(1987, pp. 94-107.	Oligonucleotide	Hybridization Techniques'	", Methods in	Enzymology, Vol.	154, No. 6,	
AMINER	Jas de la constitución de la con	7. Busia		DATE CONSIDEREI	0 5 6.1	Level Joseph	,	

Sheel 4 of 13			(NEOD)	IATION OLOGI CONTEST CTATE				
FORM PTO 144	9 (modifie	nd)	INFORM	ATTY DOCKET NO.		L NO.		
U	I.S. DEP	ARTMENT OF COMMER	CE	99_1174		22,804		
	OF REFEI	AND TRADEMARK OFFI		APPLICANT Edwin SOUTHERN				
		everal sheets if necessary) ted to PTO: December 8,	2005	FILING DATE October 22, 1999		GROUP 1631		
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	·		t	LS. PATENT DOCUMENTS				
*EXAMINER . INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DA	
18/2	DA	4,591,570	5/1986	Chang	436	518		
<u> </u>	DB							
	DC							
			FORI	EIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS				
	<u> </u>	DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLAT YES	TION NO
JAS.	DD	0 228 075	7/1987	EP				
2/5	DE	84/03151	8/1984	wo				
JEB .	DF	0 194 132	9/1986	EP				
183	DG	0 063 810	11/1982	EP				:
JEB	DH	0 130 523	1/1985	EP				
<u> </u>	·	OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (In	cluding Author, Title, Date, Pertin	nent Pages, Etc.)			
SPO	DI	E. Calva et al., "Anal Gel Electrophoresis, Chemistry, Vol. 255,	KNA-UNA Hyb	tro Synthesis of 5'-y- ³² P-I pridization, and RNase T1 pp. 11011-11016.	abeled Transcrip Digestion", The	ots from Coliphac Journal of Biolog	je λ by jical	
XD	DJ	A. R. Dunn et al., "A mRNA and Discrete	Novel Method t Multiple Region	to Map Transcripts: Evider is of the Viral Genome", C	nce for Homolog Cell, Vol. 12, Sep	y between an Ad tember 1977, pp	enovirus . 23-36.	
96	DK	G. Wengler et al.,"A S Alphaviruses", Virolog	Study of Nucleo	otide Sequence Homology 1, 1977, pp. 124-134.	Between the Nu	ucleic Acids of Di	fferent	
Je C	DL	J. M. Coffin et al., "Sti Sequence" Cell, Vol.	ructure of the G 13, No. 4, April	Genome of Moloney Murin 1978, pp. 761-773.	e Leukemia Viru:	s: A Terminally R	ledundant	
J.S.	DM	A. Palva et al., "Labor Acid Sandwich with H	atory Methods, ybridization", D	Quantification of α-Amyla NA, Vol. 7, No. 2, 1988, p	ase mRNA in <i>Bad</i> pp. 135-142.	cillus subtilis by f		
JES	i i	R. Drmanac et al., "Se presented at Cold Spri Spring Harbor, NY.	quencing of Me ing Harbor Sym	egabase Plus DNA by Hyl posium on Gene Mappin	bridization: Theolog g and Sequencin	ry of the Method g, April 27-May	', abstract 1, 1988, Cold	 i
MINER	Me	Bruses		DATE CONSIDERE	0 5 Galia	7006		$-\parallel$

Sheet 5 of 13 ·		INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT									
FORM PTO 1449		ARTMENT OF COMMER	ICE	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174		SERIAL 09/42					
P/	ATENT A OF REFER	AND TRADEMARK OFFI RENCES CITED BY APPLIC	CE	APPLICANT Edwin SOUTHER	RN						
. Date		ed to PTO: December 8,	2005	FILING DATE October 22, 1999)		GROUP 1631				
			U	S. PATENT DOCUMEN	rs						
*EXAMINER . INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	C	LASS	SUBCLASS	FILING D APPROP			
	EA										
	EB										
			FOR	EIGN PATENT DOCUME	NTS	. <u></u>	·				
		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	C	ASS	SUBÇLASS	TRANSLA YES	NOITA ON		
J813	EC	0 142 299	5/1985	EP							
Jes	ED	86/06487	11/1986	wo							
Jeb	EE	84/03564	9/1984	wo							
Jes	EF	86/00991	2/1986	wo							
Jeb	EG	92/10092	6/1992	wo							
	·	OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (In	cluding Author, Title, Dat	e, Pertinent Pages	, Etc.)	·				
X6	EH	R. Drmanac et al., " Harbor Symposium	Sequencing by	Hybridization . The	rv of the Meth	nd" nost	er presented at Cold Spring Ha	Cold Spring rbor, NY.			
35,1800	EI	1. Labat "Subfragme Report, Labat Thesis	ents as an inform s, (and English	native characteristic translation), 1988.	of the DNA m	olecule -	- computer simu	lation", Sea	rch		
JB	EJ	R. Frank et al., "Simi Complete Methodolo	ultaneous Syntt gy", Methods ir	nesis and Biological Enzymology, Vol.	Applications of 154, No. 13, 19	f DNA F	ragments: An E 221-251.	ficient and			
Je2	EK	R. Frank et al., "A ne oligonucleotides: seg	w general appr mental solid su	oach for the simulta pports", Nucleic Ac	neous chemic ids Research,	al synthe	sis of large num No. 13, 1983, p	nber of 0. 4365-437	7.		
y65	-	A. R. Brautigam et al Deoxyribonucleic Aci pp. 226-234.	., "Rapid Typing d Hybridization'	of Herpes Simplex , Journal of Clinical	Virus Isolates Microbiology,	by Deox Vol. 12,	yribonucleic Ac No. 2, August 1	d: 980,			
JB	ЕМ	R. K. Saiki et al., "Ana Oligonucleotide Probe	alysis of Enzymes", Nature, Vol	atically Amplified β- . 324, November 19	globin and HL 186, pp. 163-16	A-DQα D 66.	NA with Allele-S	Specific			
CAMINER	o K	S. Surer	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	DATE CON	SIDERED 5	Calm	rary 200	7	$-\parallel$		

Sheet 6 of 13			INFORM	ATION DISCLOSURE STATEME	NT			
FORM PTO 144		ர ARTMENT OF COMMER	CE	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174		SERIAL NO. 09/422,804		
F	PATENT A	AND TRADEMARK OFFI RENCES CITED BY APPLIC	CE .	APPLICANT Edwin SOUTHERN				
Date		ed to PTO: December 8,	2005	FILING DATE October 22, 1999		GROUI 1631	>	
			U	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS				
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CL	ASS SUBCL		NG DATE IF
	FA							
	FB		<u> </u>					
		1		EIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS	- ₁			
10/2	_	DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CL	ASS SUBCL		NSLATION ES NO
	FC	0 305 929	3/1989	ЕP				
365	FD	0 304 202	2/1989	EP				
	FE							
	FF				ļ			
	FG				<u> </u>			
0.4		OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (In	cluding Author, Title, Date, Perti	nent Pages, i	Etc.)		
12)	FH	different eligodeoxyi	ibonucleotides	ethods for sequencing of a using a new, mechanicall r 4,1985, pp. 1173-1184.	nucleic ac y stable a	ids I. Simultaned nion-exchange p	ous sequencing paper", Nucleic	of Acid
PG	FI	B. Lewin, Ed., "Gen	es", Third Editio	on, 1987, pp. 360-362, Jol	hn Wiley &	& Sons, NY, NY.		
Jess .	FJ	R. B. Wallace et al., Base Pair Mismatch	"Hybridization o , Nucleic Acids	of Synthetic Oligodeoxyrib Research, Vol. 6, No. 11,	onucleotic , 1979, pp	les to O _x 174 DN . 3543-3557.	A: The Effect o	f Single
J&	FK	G. Beltz et al., "Isolat Methods", Methods in	ion of Multigend Enzymology, V	e Families and Determina Vol. 100, No. 19, 1983, pp	tion of Ho 5. 266-285	mologies by Filte	er Hybridization	
26°	FL	Russian Onginal, Vol	. 303, No. 1-6, I	of the Academy of Scienc November-December 198 um Publishing Corporatio	8 nn 355	-452 and Tranct	stry Section, ation from Rus	sian,
3	FM	F. C. Kafatos et al., "[Determination o	f Nucleic Acid Sequence eic Acids Research, Vol. 7	Homologie	es and Relative (Concentrations 552.	by
INER	Le	(Bruses		DATE CONSIDERE	n 7 /		2026	

Sheet 7 of 13 ·	··		INFORM	ATION DISCLOSURE STATEME	NT				
FORM PTO 1449	•	d) ARTMENT OF COMMERC	CE	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174		tial no. 422,804			
P	ATENT A	AND TRADEMARK OFFICE RENCES CITED BY APPLICA	CE	APPLICANT Edwin SOUTHERN					
Date		everal sheets if necessary) ed to PTO: December 8,	2005	FILING DATE October 22, 1999		GROUP 1631			
			U	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS					
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE I		
	GA								
	GB								
	GC						*		
		1	FORE	EIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES N		
	GD	<u> </u>							
	GE								
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	GF								
	GG								
	GH								
	,	OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (in	cluding Author, Title, Date, Pertin	ent Pages, Etc.)				
A(2)	GI	R. J. Lipshutz et al., Vol. 19, No. 3, 1995,	"Using Oligonu pp. 442-447.	cleotide Probe Arrays to A	ccess Geneti	c Diversity", BioTe	chniques,		
JSB)	Gl	T. R. Gingeras et al., 15, No. 13, 1987, pp.	"Hybridization . 5373-5390.	Properties of Immobilized	Nucleic Acid	', Nucleic Acids Re	esearch, Vol.		
JB.	GK	P.T. Gilham, "The Sy Polynucleotides", J. A	nthesis of Poly Am. Chem. Soc	nucleotide-Celluloses and c., Vol. 86, November 20, 1	Their use in (1964, pp. 498)	the Fractionation o 2-4985.	ſ		
JB	GL	H. M. Geysen et al., " Methods, Vol. 102, 19	Strategies for I 987, pp. 259-27	Epitope Analysis using Per 74.	ptide Synthes	is", Journal of Imm	unological		
JED	GM	G. M. Church et al., "G	Genomic Sequ	encing", Proc. Natl. Acad.	Sci., Vol. 81(7	7), April 1984, pp.	1991-1995.		
JB3	GN	V. J. Kidd et al., "α ₁ -A Nature, Vol. 304, July	ntitrypsin Defic 1983, pp. 230-	iency Detection by Direct / 234.	Analysis of the	e Mutation in the G	ene",		
AMINER	Joseph	5 Bruses		DATE CONSIDERE	o 5 Ca	leman 200	7		

								
Sheet 8 of 13 ·			INFORM	ATION DISCLOSURE STATEM	ENT			
FORM PTO 1449) RTMENT OF COMMERC	CF.	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174		AL NO. 22,804		
P	ATENT A OF REFER	ND TRADEMARK OFFICE ENCES CITED BY APPLICA	E	APPLICANT Edwin SOUTHERN				
Date		veral sheets if necessary) ed to PTO: December 8,	2005	FILING DATE October 22, 1999		GROUP 1631		
			U	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS				
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE	
	НА							
····	НВ							
	нс			,				
	HD							
		<u> </u>	FORE	IGN PATENT DOCUMENTS				
	ļ	DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES NO	
	HE							
	HF							
	T			ncluding Author, Title, Date, Per				
ASS	HG	P. Masinkowski et a Breast Cancer Cell I	I.,"Cloning f cD Line", Nucleic A	NA Sequences of Hormo Acids Research, Vol. 10,	one-regulated Go No. 24, 1982, pp	ene from the MCF 5. 7895-7903.	-7 Human	
J65	НН	G. K. Sim et al., "Us Multigene Families",	e of a cDNA Lit Cell, Vol. 18, N	orary for Studies on Evolution 1979, p	ution and Develop. 1303-1316.	opment Expressio	n of the Chorion	
J M3	н	Margaret L. M. Ande Approach, 1985, pp	rson et al., "Qu . 73-111, IRL P	antitative Filter Hybridisa ress, Washington, D.C.	ation", Nucleic A	ction Hybridisation	n, A Practical	
Jes	HJ.	W. Bains et al., "A N pp. 303-307.	ovel Method for	r Nucleic Acid Sequence	Determination",	J. Theor. Biol., V	ol. 135, 1988,	
Jes Jes	НК	U. B. Voss et al., "Th Society Transactions	e Immobilizatio , Vol. 16, 1988	n of Oligonucleotides an pp. 216-217.	d Their Hybridiz	ation Properties",	Biochemical	
25	HL	13, 1987, pp. 5353-5	372.	of oligonucleotides to So	lid Supports", N	ucleic Acids Rese	arch, Vol. 15, No.	
Jest 1	НМ	1	igs, Vol. 43, No	. 7, May 4, 1984, Abstrac		novel unive	ersal	
RS	ни			", A Laboratory Manual,		bor Laboratory, 19	982, ρ. 282, Cold	
MER	Je	& Bruces		DATE CONSIDER	ED Theli	vary 200	6	

			<u> </u>					
Sheet 9 of 13 •			INFORM	ATION DISCLOSURE STATEN	MENT			
FORM PTO 144	·) ARTMENT OF COMMERC	·E	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174	1	AL NO. 22,804		
F	OF REFE	AND TRADEMARK OFFIC RENCES CITED BY APPLICA	Ε	APPLICANT Edwin SOUTHERN				
Date		everal sheets if necessary) ted to PTO: December 8, 2	2005	FILING DATE October 22, 1999		GROUP 1631		
				S. PATENT DOCUMENTS		 		
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE	
	IA							
<u>'</u>			FOR	EIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS			,	
		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES NO	
	IB							
		OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (Including Author, Title, Date, Pe	ortinent Pages, Etc.)			
Jos	IC	C. R. Cantor et al., " pp. 1378-1383.	Report on the	Sequencing by Hybridiza	ation Workshop",	, Genomics, Vol.	13, 1992,	
JB	ID.	T. L. Bugawan et al., Sequencing-Specific	"Rapid HLA-I Oligonucleoti	OLB Typing Using Enzym de Probes", Immunogen	natically Amplified etics, Vol. 32, 19	d DNA and Nonr 90, pp. 231-241.	adioactive	
no constant	ΙE	Global Technology G	Group, Flier for	PA Consulting Group, 1	988.		-	
SCO	IF	Stephen P. A. Fodor Vol. 251, February 19	et al., "Light-C 5, 1991, pp. 76	Directed, Spatially Addres	ssable Parallel C	hemical Synthes	is", Science,	
yo	IG	U. Maskos et al., "A S Synthesised on a Gla	Study of Oligor ss Support", t	nucleotide Reassociation Nucleic Acids Research,	using Large Arr. Vol. 21, No. 20,	ays of Oligonucle 1992, pp. 4663-4	eotides 1669.	
yo	IН	U. Maskos et al., "Par Factors Influencing O pp. 1675-1678.	rallel Analysis ligonucleotide	of Oligodeoxyribonucleo Duplex Formation", Nuc	tide (Oligonucleo leic Acids Resea	otide) Interaction arch, Vol. 20, No.	s. I. Analysis of . 7, 1992,	
JS.	11	J. C. Williams et al., " Dangling Ends on Du	Studies of Oligoplex Yield", N	gonucleotide Interactions ucleic Acids Research, V	by Hybridisation ol. 22, No. 8, 19	to Arrays: The I 94, pp. 1365-136	influence of 67.	
K)	IJ	IJ E. M. Southern et al., "Arrays of Complementary Oligonucleotides for Analysing the Hybridisation Behaviour of Nucleic Acids, Nucleic Acids Research, Vol. 22, No. 8, 1994, pp.1368-1373.						
X6	ΙΚ	M. S. Shchepinov et a Nucleic Acids Researc	I.,"Steric Facto	ors Influencing Hybridisa 6, 1997, pp. 1155-1161	tion of Nucleic Ad	cids to Oligonucl	eotide Arrays",	
JO.	IL	S. C Case-Green et al to Oligonucleotides", N	,"Studies on t lucleic Acids F	he Base Pairing Properti Research, Vol. 22, No. 2,	es of Deoxyinosi 1994, pp. 131-1	ne by Solid Phas 36.	se Hybridisation	
AMINER		1. Brusia		DATE CONSIDER	56.0	way de	no b	

Sheet 10 of 13			INFORM	ATION DISCLOSURE STATEMEN	IT				
FORM PTO 1449 U.	•	() RTMENT OF COMMERC		ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174	1	SERIAL NO. 09/422,804			
P/	ATENT A OF REFER	ND TRADEMARK OFFIC	E	APPLICANT Edwin SOUTHERN					
Date		ed to PTO: December 8, 2	2005	FILING DATE October 22, 1999		GROUP 1631			
. <u> </u>			U.	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS					
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLAS	S SUBCLAS	S FILING D APPROP		
•	JA								
		T	FORE	EIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS	T		-т		
	-	DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLAS	S SUBCLASS	S TRANSU YES	ATION NO	
	JB								
		OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (I	including Author, Title, Date, Pertin	ent Pages, E	tc.)			
JB	JC	U. Maskos et al., "A Acids Research, Vo		for the Parallel Analysis of 993, 2269-2270.	Multiple N	Autations in Multip	ole Samples", N	ucleic	
JB	JD		M. J. Kozal et al., "Extensive Polymorphisms Observed in HIV-1 Clade B Protease Gene Using High-Density Oligonucleotide Arrays", Nature Medicine, Vol. 2, No. 7, July 1996, pp. 753-759.						
JRS	JE	M. Chee et al., "Acce 1996, pp. 610-614.	essing Genetic	Information with High-Den	sity DNA	Arrays", Science,	Vol. 274, Octob	er	
Som	JF	Kirk -Othmer, Encycl	opedia of Cher	mical Technology, Third Ed	dition, Vol.	3, рр. 487-491, 1	978.		
H67	JG	Kirk-Othmer, Encyclo	pedia of Chem	nical Technology, Third Edi	ition, Vol.	15, p. 224, 1981.			
JB .	JH	R. Polsky-Cynkin et a Sandwich Hybridizatio	nl.,"Use of DNA on, Clinical Ch	A Immobilized on Plastic an nemistry, Vol. 31, No. 9, 19	d Agarose 85, pp. 14	Supports to Dete 38-1443.	ect DNA by		
HS	JI	J. Welsh et al.,"Protei	in-DNA Cross-	Linking" TIBS, Vol. 9, Dece	ember 198	4, pp. 505-508.		•	
80	IJ	G. H. Parsons, Jr., "A pp. 224-238.	G. H. Parsons, Jr., "Antibody-Coated Plastic Tubes in Radioimmunoassay", Meth., Enzymol., Vol. 73, 1973, pp. 224-238.						
SB	JK	Southern et al., Genor Oligonucleotides", Vol	mics, "Analyzin I.13, 1992, pp.	ng and Comprising Nucleic 1008-1017.	Acid Sequ	uences by Hybridi	zation to Arrays	of	
	JL								
AMINER		2 Breeze		DATE CONCIDENCE		1. 1. 1. 1.			

Sheet 11 of 13 INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT FORM PTO 1449 (modified) ATTY DOCKET NO. SERIAL NO. 99_1174 09/422,804 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE APPLICANT LIST OF REFERENCES CITED BY APPLICANT(S) Edwin SOUTHERN (Use several sheets if necessary) **FILING DATE** GROUP Date Submitted to PTO: December 8, 2005 October 22, 1999 1631 U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS *EXAMINER DOCUMENT DATE NAME CLASS **SUBCLASS** FILING DATE IF INITIAL NUMBER **APPROPRIATE** KA 5,486,452 1/1996 Gordon et al. 435 5 KB 4,994,373 2/1991 Stavrianopoulos et al. 435 6 KC 4,968,602 11/1990 Dattagupta 435 6 KD 4.961.915 10/1990 Martin 422 116 ΚE 4,849,330 7/1989 Humphries et al. 435 4 KF 4,451,433 5/1984 Yamashita et al. 422 63 KG 5,202,231 4/1993 Drmanac 435 6 KH 4,299,916 11/1981 Litman et al. 435 6 **FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS** DOCUMENT DATE COUNTRY **CLASS** SUBCLASS **TRANSLATION** NUMBER YES NO KI 84/01031 3/1984 WO OTHER DOCUMENT(S) (Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, Etc.) KJ Webster's Third New International Dictionary, G & C Merriam Company, Publishers, Springfield, Massachusetts, USA, 1966, pages with the definitions of the terms "solid" and "sheet". KK The American Heritage Dictionary, Second College Edition, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, Massachusetts, 1991, page with the definition of the term "smooth". The Dictionary of Ceramic Science and Engineering, Plenum Press, New York, NY, 1984 - definition of "smooth KL glass". Academic Press Dictionary of Science and Technology, San Diego, CA, 1992 - definition of "smooth". KM KN S. F. Wolf et al., "Rapid Hybridization Kinetics of DNA Attached to Submicron Latex Particles", Nucleic Acids Research, Vol. 15, No. 7, 1987, pp. 2911-2926. J. N. Kremsky et al., "Immobilization of DNA via Oligonucleotides Containing an Aldehyde or Carboxylic Acid KO Group at the 5' Terminus", Nucleic Acids Research, Vol. 15, No. 7, 1987, pp. 2891-2909. **EXAMINER** Elevan nec DATE CONSIDERED

Sheet 12 of 13			INFORM	NATION DISCLOSURE STATEM	ENT				
FORM PTO 144	J.S. DEPAR	RTMENT OF COMMERC	CE	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174		SERIAL NO. 09/422,804			
	OF REFERE	NO TRADEMARK OFFICENCES CITED BY APPLICA		APPLICANT Edwin SOUTHERN					
Dat		eral sheets if necessary) If to PTO: December 8,	2005	FILING DATE October 22, 1999		GROUP 1631			
		Ţ		J.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS					
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLA	SS SUBCLASS	FILING DATE I		
	LA								
	LB								
r	LC					•			
	.		FOR	EIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS					
•		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLAS	S SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES NO		
	LD								
	LE								
· - · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	LF	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·							
	LG								
····	LH	·							
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	7 - T			ncluding Author, Title, Date, Perti		c.)			
	LI	Letter to Simon Kiddl	e from Dr. Re	nzo Malvano, November 2	002.				
(LJ	Letter to Simon Kiddl	e from Dr. Gia	n Carlo Zucchelli, Noveml	per 2002.				
15 K	LK [Declaration of Profess	soc Alberto Ali	pertini, November 2002.					
106115K	נג כ	Declaration of Dr. Gia	anni Messeni	November 2002.	···				
	LM S	Second Statement of	Professor Rog	er Ekins, January 2003.	-				
									
INER	45-1	Fresch		DATE CONSIDERE	D TF.	luvary 2006	<u> </u>		

Sheet 13 of 13			INFORMA	TION DISCLOSURE STATEM	ENT	_ =			
FORM PTO 1449 (modified) U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE			ATTY DOCKET NO. SERIAL NO. 09/422,804						
PA	TENT A	ND TRADEMARK OFFICENCES CITED BY APPLICAL	E	APPLICANT Edwin SOUTHERN					
Date :		d to PTO: December 8, 2	005	FILING DATE October 22, 1999			GROUP 1631		
	-,		U.	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS				,	
*EXAMINER INITIAL	ļ	DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CI	ASS	SUBCLASS	FILING D APPROP	
•	МА								
	МВ								·
	- -		FORE	IGN PATENT DOCUMENTS					
		DOCUMENT NUMBER	OATE	COUNTRY	CL	ASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSL/ YES	NOITA ON
	WC								
	MD					<u>.</u>			
	·-	OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (II	ncluding Author, Title, Date, Per	tinent Pages	, Etc.)			
2000/2	ME	Slides used in Profes April 1988.	ssor Ekins' lect	ture at the International E	Biotech Rt	A '88 C	onférence in Flo	rence on 11	th
AB	MF	Lev. D. Gelb and K.E Data Inversion", Fun	E. Gubbins, "Cl damentals of A	naracterization of Porous Adsorption, Vol. 6, 1999,	Glasses pp. 551-5	by Adso 56.	orption: Models,	Simulations	and
J83	MG	Pharmacia Catalogue	e 1998, page d	lescribing Hybond-NX.					
ro oplished	мн	Translation of EP A C	197266 filed fo	or UK national validation	1991.			<u> </u>	
006/15/6	МІ	E. M. Southern, Awar	d Molecular Bi	oanalytics 2004, Biograp	ohy.				
1700	MJ	Award Molecular Bioa	analytics 2004.						
J63	MK	Bio Array News, Vol.	1, No. 1, June	1, 2001, pp. 1-10.					
Jeh	ML	News Events, Journal	of Biomolecul	ar Techniques, Vol. 15, 2	2004, рр.	152-15	3.		
XAMINER	Jul.	S. Bruser	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	DATE CONSIDER	RED 5	Feler	usey 200 6	,	

Notice of References Cited

Application/Control No.

O9/422,804

Examiner

John S. Brusca

Applicant(s)/Patent Under
Reexamination
SOUTHERN, EDWIN

Art Unit
Page 1 of 1

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

	*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Name	Classification
/[*	Α	US-3,356,462	12-1967	COOKE NELSON M; et. al.	422/102
		В	US-			
		С	US-			
		D	US-		:	
		£	US-			
		F	US-			
		G	US-			
		н	US-			
		1	US-			
		J	US-			
		к	US-			
		L	US-			
		М	US-			

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

				ALIGH I MILITI DO		
*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Country	Name	Classification
L	N					
	0					
	Р					
	Q					
	R					
	S					
	Т				·	

NON-PATENT DOCUMENTS

-		
/*		Include as applicable: Author, Title Date, Publisher, Edition or Volume, Pertinent Pages)
	υ	Caulfield et al. A Computer Program for the Evaluation of ELISA Data Obtained Using an Automated Microtiter Plate Absorbance Reader. J. Immunol. Methods Vol. 74, pages 205-215 (1984)
	V	Suggs et al. Use of synthetic oligonucleotides as hybridization probes: Isolation of cloned cDNA sequences for human beta2-microglobulin. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA Vol. 78, pages 6613-6617 (1981)
	w	
	x	

*A copy of this reference is not being furnished with this Office action. (See MPEP § 707.05(a).)

Dates in MM-YYYY format are publication dates. Classifications may be US or foreign.

This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning Operations and is not part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

BLACK BORDERS

IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES

FADED TEXT OR DRAWING

BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING

SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES

COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS

GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

☐ OTHER:

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.